UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 09/936,531 | 09/11/2001 | Yvan Strauven | Ų.MINIERE-03 | 4239 |
| 42253 MISHRILAL J | 7590 03/23/2007 AIN | | EXAMINER | |
| 11620 MASTERS RUN ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21042 | | | CREPEAU, JONATHAN | |
| ELLICOTT CI | 1 Y, MD 21042 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1745 | |
| | | | • | |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR | Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MO | NTHS | 03/23/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | | 4 |
|---|--|---|----|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/936,531 | STRAUVEN ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jonathan S. Crepeau | 1745 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | opears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | • | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 | February 2007. | | |
| ·— · | is action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allows | ance except for formal matters, pro | secution as to the merits is | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | 53 O.G. 213. | |
| Disposition of Claims | | . , | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application | n | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ | or election requirement. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin | ner. | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac | | Examiner. | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | • | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre | ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d |). |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E | Examiner. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152. | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreiga) All b) Some * c) None of: | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) |)-(d) or (f). | |
| Certified copies of the priority documer | nts have been received. | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documer | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the price | • | ed in this National Stage | |
| application from the International Burea | • | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis | st of the certified copies not receive | ed. | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | (PTO-413) | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) Notice of Informal P | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-15-07</u> . | 6) Other: | | |

Art Unit: 1745

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action addresses claims 1-17. The claims remain rejected herein for the reasons of record. Accordingly, this action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 94/19502 in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent 5,917,113).

Regarding claim 5, WO '502 is directed to an alkaline battery comprising an anode, cathode, and electrolyte (see claim 23 of the reference). Regarding claim 1, the anode comprises a zinc alloy having a composition which anticipates each of the claimed compositions (a), (b), and (c). For example, the alloy disclosed at page 5, line 30, which contains 70 ppm (0.007 wt%) Al and 250 ppm (0.025 wt%) Bi, anticipates alloy (c) of instant claim 1. The alloy disclosed at page 6, line 12 (0.007 wt% Al, 0.025 wt% In) anticipates alloy (a) of instant claim 1. The alloy disclosed at page 6, line 21 (0.003 wt% Al, 0.025 wt% In, 0.025 wt% Bi) anticipates alloy (b) of instant claims 1 and 2. Regarding claim 6, the powder comprises metal cemented out of the electrolyte (see claim 24 of the reference). Regarding claim 1, the powder can be made by a centrifugal atomization process (see page 3, line 30).

Application/Control Number: 09/936,531 Page 3

Art Unit: 1745

WO '502 does not expressly teach that the centrifugal atomization process is carried out in an atmosphere with a relatively low (i.e., <4vol%) oxygen content, as recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 7-11 and 15-17.

Suzuki is directed to a process for producing spherical metal particles. The process involves centrifugally atomizing molten metal in an atmosphere containing 3-600 ppm oxygen (see abstract).

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the disclosure of Suzuki would motivate the artisan to conduct the centrifugal atomization of WO '502 in an atmosphere containing a relatively low (i.e., 3-600 ppm) amount of oxygen. In column 4, line 43, Suzuki teaches that "as has been discussed above in detail, the production process of the present invention permits mass-production of fluent, spherical metal particles having a smooth surface, in low cost and excellent in dispersibility in a dispersing medium." Accordingly, the artisan would be motivated to conduct the centrifugal atomization of WO '502 in an atmosphere containing a relatively low (i.e., 3-600 ppm) amount of oxygen. Although the parts per million unit of the Suzuki reference is determined on a mass basis (see abstract), this is still believed to render obvious the claimed volume percentages of oxygen content (less than 4% as recited in claim 1, or 0.2-3.5% as recited in claim 3).

Art Unit: 1745

Response to Arguments

Page 4

3. Applicant's arguments filed February 13, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that it is known in the art that the particles in battery-grade zinc powders do not have spherical shapes, as evidenced by the relevant portions of *Handbook of* Batteries and WO 99/07030. It is further contended that a skilled artisan would not be motivated to apply the teachings of Suzuki to WO 94/19502 because Suzuki discloses that his centrifugal atomization process produces spherical particles. Applicant's argument has been considered but is not persuasive for the following reasons. U.S. Patent 6,472,103 to Durkot et al (effective date July 15, 1998), is directed to a zinc electrode for an alkaline battery. In the abstract, the reference teaches that "the zinc-based particles can be alloyed with, for example, indium and/or bismuth and be of spherical, acicular, or flake shape" (emphasis added). Further, it is taught at column 3, line 31 that "[t]he zinc-based particles can be spherical or nonspherical in shape." Thus, the reference clearly teaches that spherical zinc particles are appropriate for use in an alkaline battery electrode. As such, the skilled artisan would understand that the teachings of Suzuki relating to spherical particles produced by centrifugal atomization would be applicable to the centrifugally atomized powders of WO '502. In addition, Applicant's contention that Handbook of Batteries and WO 99/07030 "teach away" from spherical particles is not persuasive. Both of these documents disclose that non-spherical particle shapes are appropriate for use in battery grade zinc powders, but neither reference contains an explicit teaching that using spherical powder is detrimental or otherwise produces a negative effect. Thus, a person of skill in the art, also being aware of US 6,472,103, would view the non-spherical shapes as preferred embodiments of a zinc powder. The disclosure of such preferred embodiments

Art Unit: 1745

generally does not constitute a "teaching away" from nonpreferred embodiments (MPEP 2123 (II)). Further, pursuant to MPEP 2143.01(II), to the extent that the teachings in the prior art are considered to be "conflicting," the suggestive power of each reference must be weighed in determining obviousness of the claimed invention. In this case, the fact that spherical particles are disclosed as suitable for use in Zn powders enables the skilled artisan to see that the teachings of Suzuki are relevant to the powders of WO '502. Accordingly, the rejection as stated above is believed to be proper.

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1745

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Crepeau whose telephone number is (571) 272-1299. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan, can be reached at (571) 272-1292. The phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-1700. Documents may be faxed to the central fax server at (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Crepeau Primary Examiner Art Unit 1745 March 19, 2007